



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/696,097

10/28/2003

Paramjit Kahlon

OIC0099US

6621

60975 7590 12/22/2011  
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP  
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE  
BLDG. H, SUITE 250  
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER

OBEID, FAHD A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3627

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/22/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/696,097	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAHLON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> FAHD OBEID	<b>Art Unit</b> 3627	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 34-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 34-37 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of the Application***

1. This is in reply to communication filed on 11/14/2011.
2. No claims have been added or cancelled.
3. Claim 37 has been amended.
4. Claims 1-22 and 34-37 are currently pending and have been examined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject

Art Unit: 3627

matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**6. Claims 1-4, 12-15, and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman (US 5,708,828) in view of Balgeman (US 5,446,880), and further in view of King (US 2003/0110104).**

**7. Regarding Claims 1-4 and 34-37:** Coleman discloses a computer-implemented method for managing inventory, the method comprising:

- synchronizing information between a source computerized inventory management system and a target computerized inventory management system, wherein the source computerized inventory management system and the target computerized inventory management system are among a plurality of computerized inventory management systems, the synchronizing is bi-directional, wherein the synchronizing is performed by an integration server and the synchronizing comprises (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col 1 lns 9-13):
  - extracting balance information in a source format, wherein the source format is a format used by the source computerized inventory management system, and the balance information in the source format is

Art Unit: 3627

associated with the source computerized inventory management system  
(abstract, figs.2B, 3, col 1 lns 9-13),

- converting the information in the source format into information in an intermediate format (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col 1 lns 9-13);
- receiving target balance information, wherein the target balance information in the target format is associated with the target computerized inventory management system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col 1 lns 9-13);
- converting the target balance information into target balance information in the intermediate format (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col 1 lns 9-13);
- converting the inventory balance delta into information in a target format, wherein the target format is a format used by the target computerized inventory management system, the information in the target format comprises the balance delta, and the information in the target format is associated with the target computerized inventory management system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col 1 lns 9-13);

Coleman does not explicitly teach generating an inventory balance delta, wherein the inventory balance delta is calculated as a difference between a source inventory balance and a target inventory balance.

However, Balgeman teaches the following:

- requesting existing target information from the target computerized inventory management system, wherein the requesting is performed by the integration server (C2 L17-24, C5 L49-67, C6 L1-19);

Art Unit: 3627

- updating existing balance information using the balance information in the target format, wherein the existing balance information is in the target format, the existing balance information is associated with the target computerized inventory management system, and the updating is based, at least in part, on the balance difference (C8 L54-60, claims 3, 6, 7, & 9).

Coleman and Balgeman fail to explicitly teach generating an inventory balance delta, wherein the inventory balance delta is calculated as a difference between a source inventory balance and a target inventory balance.

However, King does teach generating an inventory balance delta, wherein the inventory balance delta is calculated as a difference between a source inventory balance and a target inventory balance (§§ 40, 43, and 80);

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use King's and Balgeman's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, for the advantage of minimizing inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry. Also, for the advantage of providing a communication system which provides flexibility by allowing individual nodes to utilize different databases and which automatically updates corresponding records at different databases with a minimum of burden on the users (Balgeman; C1 L66-67, C2 L1-2).

Art Unit: 3627

**8. Claims 5-11 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman (US 5,708,828) in view of Balgeman (US 5,446,880), and further in view of King (US 2003/0110104) as applied to claims 1-4, 12-15, and 33-34 above, and further in view of Katz (US 2002/0178077).**

9. Regarding Claims 5-11: Coleman discloses the claimed invention except for an inventory balances elements.

However, Katz does disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 4, wherein the hierarchy of data elements includes a plurality of inventory balance elements comprises:

- A list of inventory balances element;
- An inventory balance related inventory location element;
- A list of related inventory balances for defining a plurality of related inventory balances;
- A custom data element for defining customized attributes for the inventory, wherein each of the plurality of balance data elements comprises: a bucket code element; a quantity of product element; a product unit of measure code element; and a balance data custom data element (¶¶ 42, 46, 179, 181, 267).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Katz's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, for the advantage of minimizing inventory management data

Art Unit: 3627

conversions and to facilitate data exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry.

10. Regarding Claims 12-22: all limitations as recited have been analyzed and rejected with respect to claims 1-11 and 34-37. Claims 12-22 pertains to a computer-readable storage medium having associated instructions corresponding to the computer-implemented method of claims 1-11 and 34-37. Claims 12-22 do not teach or define any new limitations beyond claims 1-11 and 34-37, therefore they are rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular the applicant argues that: a) the cited references do not teach "generating an inventory balance delta, wherein the inventory balance delta is calculated as a difference between a source inventory balance and a target inventory balance"

In response to a) examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. King teaches a server which calculates a source inventory data such as forecasted demands and also calculates target inventory data such as in-transit/shipped orders to obtain an inventory balance data such as the actual on-hand demand (¶¶ 40, 43, and 80);

Therefore, King still meets the scope of the limitation as currently claimed.



***Conclusion***

**12. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FAHD OBEID whose telephone number is (571)270-3324. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fahd A Obeid/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3627  
December 20, 2011